



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,181	10/30/2000	James M. Zombek	003636.0086	3564
7590	05/25/2004		EXAMINER	
Ashok K. Mannava 281 Murtha Street Alexandria, VA 22304			NAJJAR, SALEH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	15
			DATE MAILED: 05/25/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/698,181	ZOMBEK ET AL.
	Examiner Saleh Najjar	Art Unit 2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10,13,15-19 and 27-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10,13,15-19 and 27-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2157

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed December 20, 2003. Claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, 13, 17, 19, and 27 were amended. Claims 3, 9, 11-12, 14, and 20-26 were canceled. Claims 33-34 were newly added. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 13, 15-19, and 27-34 are pending. Claims 1-19, 27-32 represents system and method for Re-Directing Requests from Browsers for communication over Non-IP based networks.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 1 of the specification is missing updated application information.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 8, 10, and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,305.

Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a WEB application interface system in a mobile-based client server system (see abstract).

As to claim 8, Gupta teaches a method of deploying content to client applications, comprising:

accepting inbound messages from a client application running on a client device via a proxy IP/port (see figs. 1-2; col. 4-5, see proxy 34);

accessing a HTTP redirector acting as a client side proxy (see fig. 2; col. 4, lines 10-40, proxy layer 34);

packaging the inbound messages into an internal message format with an HTTP redirector (see col. 5, lines 1-10, Gupta discloses that a messages are packed for transmission by proxy 34);

forwarding the packaged message to a back-end server via a message router (see figs. 2-3; col. Gupta discloses that the proxy forwards the packaged message through the client message handler 36 and server message handler 40 which act as gateways, a router is a layer 3 gateway);

receiving a response from a web server (see col. 5, lines 30-50, Gupta discloses that a response is received from web server 44);

packaging the response into the internal message format with the back-end server and forwarding the response to the HTTP redirector via a message router and a protocol gateway (see figs. 2-3; col. 5-6, Gupta discloses that WEB agent 42 packs the response back to the internal message format which is forwarded by the message handler 40 to the client message handler system 36, the message handlers act as a gateway); and

As to claim 10, Gupta teaches the method of claim 8 above further comprising:

Unpacking the packaged response by the HTTP redirector; and transferring the unpacked response to the client application running on the client device via the proxy IP/port (see col. 4, lines 30-45, Gupta discloses that the proxy 34 recovers the raw HTTP message responses sent to the client).

As to claim 29, Gupta teaches a messaging system comprising:

A client device having: a web browser; a redirector communicating with the web browser and packaging messages from the web browser in a fundamental network protocol (see col. 5, lines 1-10, Gupta discloses that a messages are packed for transmission by proxy 34);

A server; a plurality of wireless networks, each of which is adapted to: communicate messages between the client device and the server and support one or more wireless network protocols (see fig. 1);

A protocol gateway encapsulating the fundamental network protocol, which underlies each of the one or more wireless network protocols (see col. 4, lines 25-40, Gupta discloses that the client message handler acts as a gateway);

Means for communicating messages between the web browser and the server over a selected wireless network protocol through the protocol gateway independent of the wireless network protocol (see col. 4-5, Gupta discloses that the client and server communicate through message handlers that act as gateways).

As to claim 30, Gupta teaches the system of claim 30 above wherein the server is an HTTP proxy server, which is adapted to receive a plurality of HTTP{ requests from the client device, send each the request over the Internet to the server and transmit a response corresponding thereto from the server to the client device (see col. 4).

As to claim 31, Gupta teaches the system of claim 29 above, wherein the proxy server is adapted to support one or more HTTP protocols (see col. 4-5).

As to claim 32, Gupta teaches the system of claim 29 above wherein the HTTP proxy server comprises:

Means for creating a TCP/IP socket connection; and means for managing the TCP/IP socket connection (see col. 4-5).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 13, 15-19, 27-28, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,305 in view of Aravamudhan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,563,919 (referred to hereafter as Ara).

Gupta teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a WEB application interface system in a mobile-based client server system (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Gupta teaches a method of deploying content to client applications, comprising:

Accepting inbound messages from a client application running on a client device via a proxy IP/port (see figs. 1-2; col. 4-5, see proxy 34);

packaging the inbound messages into an internal message format with an HTTP redirector (see col. 4-5, Gupta discloses that a messages are redirected through the proxy 34);

forwarding the packaged message to a back-end server; receiving a response from a web server (see col. 5, lines 30-45, Gupta discloses that a request is forwarded by the server 22 to the web server 44);

packaging the response into the internal message format with the back-end server and forwarding the response to the HTTP redirector (see figs. 2-3; col. 4, Gupta discloses that WEB agent 42 packs the response back to the internal message format which is forwarded by the message handler 42 to the client system); and

transferring the response to the client application running on the client device via the proxy IP/port (see figs. 1-3; col. 5-6).

Gupta fails to teach the limitation wherein the HTTP redirector sits on top of a library of mobile service and accesses it to obtain information about a wireless protocols supported by the client device.

However, Ara teaches a gateway cluster having a number of gateways for different types of communication protocols by converting network messages to normalized messages by querying the mobile systems where the messages were generated (see abstract). Ara teaches HTTP redirector sits on top of a library of mobile service (see col. 6, Ara discloses that a unified mobility manager UMM 30 provide a unified hardware for processing and providing responses for various types of mobile communications protocols by providing a unified directory services).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by providing a unified directory of services at the agent 42 to

provide for multiple protocol translations. One would be motivated to do so to allow for different types of mobile platforms to interact with the system.

As to claim 2, Gupta teaches the method of claim 1 above.

Gupta fails to teach the limitation wherein the library of mobile services are stored at the client. Gupta does teach that the client device may reconnect and communicate with the server via different network media (see col. 9 of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,517 which was incorporated into the Gupta reference in col. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by storing the library of services at the client side. One would be motivated to do so to allow the client to connect to the servers through different network media.

As to claim 4, Gupta teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the HTTP redirector acts as a client side proxy (see col. 4).

As to claim 5, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector provides compression of the inbound packaged message (see figs. 1-3; col. 4, lines 15-20).

As to claim 6, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector provides decompression of the response (see col. 4)

As to claim 7, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector unpacks the packaged response (see col. 4).

Claims 13, 15-19, 27-28, and 33-34 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-2, 4-7 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

7. Applicant's arguments filed December 20, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that; A) in regards to claim 1, Gupta fails to teach the claimed features; B) Gupta fails to teach the protocol gateway and that the examiner failed to provide an explanation of the pertinence to the claimed gateway features of claims 8 and 29; C) Ara fails to teach or suggest an HTTP redirector provided at the client that accesses the library of mobile services in order to obtain information about a wireless protocol .

In response to A); the argument with respect to claim 1 is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection above.

In response to B); the examiner respectfully asserts that the applicant is responsible for reading the reference in its entirety (col. 4, line 28 in Gupta specifically recites that the handler 36 acts as a gateway) see the rejection of claims 8 and 29 above.

In response to C); Ara reference was not used to teach the redirector feature of the claims. Ara was simply used to modify Gupta with regard to the claimed feature of the library of mobile services (see the rejection above with respect to claim 1).

**8.** Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**9.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The fax number for the After-Final correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7238. The fax number for official correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7239. The fax number for Non-official draft correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7240.



Saleh Najjar  
Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157